REMARKS

Claims 13-32 are in the application. All of the independent claims 13, 26 and 30 have been rejected under Section 102 based on prior art made of record by the applicants: application EP0926909A2 . Further, each of the dependent claims has either been rejected under Section 102 based on the same reference or under Section 103 based on a combination of EP0926909A2 in view of Xu (U.S. 6,738,390). Claim 13 is amended to correct an error of an apparent nature.

Applicants request reconsideration of the claims based in part on the distinction that each of the independent claims is directed to signaling messages and signaling protocols while EP0926909A2 is not at all related to such. As explained at par. [0005] of the application, a signaling protocol is the body of control methods and operating instructions according to which the signaling between two or more functional units working together is carried out. Protocols are specific to interfaces.

On the other hand, EP0926909A2 concerns, for example, provision of a node 22 that allows special end-to-end protocols to be set up after a call is established. See Par [0022] which further explains that this is in the context of arranging for any additional services. However, as noted at col. 8, lines 7 – 28 (see also Fig 4), a problem is solved wherein the intermediate node 22 converts operation identifiers, e.g., from the IV convention to the OI convention. As explained at Col. 8, lines 24 – 29, this converts "particular aspects of the messaging protocol ...in particular at least a part of an **information element** ... [Emphasis Added]" This has no relation to signaling protocols. Note again that signaling protocol relates to signaling between functional units, while EP0926909A2 relates to operation identifiers according to different conventions.

Other distinctions between the claims and the prior art are also present. Note, for example, that according to claim 18, the method performs an access function for terminals of a local data network. According to claim 20, a group of specific signaling protocols are defined and the citation of Xu to reject this claim is insufficient because the primary reference EP0926909A2 does not at all relate to signaling protocols. According to claim 23, the first protocol signal is stored in a storage device, while the "memory" disclosed at col. 8 of

EP0926909A2 does not relate to the described method. These distinctions are exemplary and other patentable differences are present in the other claims.

Generally, because the primary reference does not at all relate to signaling messages or signaling protocols, the combination applied under Section 103 will not result in any of the claimed subject matter.

For these and other reasons it is submitted that the claims are all allowable over the art of record and allowance of the application is therefore requested.

Conclusion

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: ___1/15/08___

By: _____

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830